

Remarks:

Regarding paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the title has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Also, paragraphs 8, 16-17 and 20 have been amended in the manner specified by the Examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that the "government or industry standards or requirements" is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art. One of ordinary skill in the relevant art would understand that this portion of the specification refers to, for example, the different types of finishes that are formed on the exterior surface of different automobile parts or components. As one example, it is well known to the skilled artisan that, for example, automobile interior components, such as a chrome plated decorative molding for a door of an automobile mentioned in paragraph 18 of the subject application, must have a class "A" finish. Without the class "A" finish, a motor vehicle having the less than satisfactory component would be, for example, visually unappealing to potential customers and, therefore, more difficult to sell. In view of the foregoing explanation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the above-quoted portion of the specification.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections stated in paragraphs 2-4 of the Office Action because, for example, the claims to which the Examiner made the rejections stated in these paragraphs have been cancelled, and the issues noted therein are not repeated in the new claims.

Regarding the remainder of the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner, either taken alone or in a purported combination, teach the subject matter of the new claims for a number of different reasons. First, for example, the new claims require that the portion of the chrome plated surface on which said ink image is formed be "visible to a user of a motor vehicle" that contains the automobile part. The Pryor et al. reference, which is the primary reference cited by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest this subject matter. All of the markings referred to in the background of the invention section of Pryor refer to conditions describing how or when the part were made. None of these marking are visible to the user of a motor vehicle such as, for example, a key icon that is stamped on a chrome plated surface of a decorative door molding as can be done in accordance with an

exemplary application of the present invention. Because no other reference of record provides the teaching missing from Pryor, it is respectfully submitted that the new claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

Second, for example, the new claims require that an "ink image" be printed on a chrome plated surface of an automobile part, and convey "visual information to a user of a motor vehicle about an aspect of operation of a motor vehicle that contains said automobile part." All of the markings referred to in the background of the Pryor reference do not convey any such information to the user of the motor vehicle. No other reference of record provides the teachings missing from Pryor. For this additional reason, it is respectfully suggested that the new claims are allowable.

Third, the new claims require that the ink image be formed *on a chrome plated surface* an amount of time after the ink has been agitated so that the ink that forms said ink image is generally evenly mixed to the same general extent as the ink is mixed immediately after it has been agitated and so that the clarity of the ink image formed is generally maximized. No reference of record teaches or suggests agitation of ink in the context of pad printing an ink image on a chrome plated surface of an automobile part that conveys information about an aspect of operation of the motor vehicle to a user. No prior art reference of record, taken alone or in a purported combination, link the concepts of increased clarity printing with printing on chrome plated automobile parts. For this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has provided no evidence that it would be proper to combine the prior art references together in the manner asserted in the Office Action. For example, why is it allegedly obvious to "modify the method of Pryor et al in view of Alden by heating the printed metal article as taught by Reinke et al?" Following the Examiner's line of reasoning, if it really were obvious to combine the three references together in the manner asserted, then it follows from this that there should be some indication in, for example, Reinke et al as to how the invention taught therein is applicable pad printing inks onto chrome plated automobile parts. The fact that no such teaching, or any evidence of a suggestion to combine the references, exists leads to the conclusion that the Examiner is basing his rejection on the


teachings of the subject application, which is improper hindsight reconstruction. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the prior art rejections stated in the last Office Action for this reason.

It is respectfully submitted that the new claims are in condition for allowance and, therefore, a formal notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would help expedite the prosecution of the instant application, then he is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at his convenience.

Dated: April 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Jeffrey W. Salmon

Registration No. 37,435

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 S. Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 655-1500
Facsimile: (312) 655-1501